

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/823,943	03/30/2001	Louis B. Rosenberg	IMMP127	7594	
34300 . 75	10/20/2006		EXAMINER		
	PARTMENT (51851)	•	CEGIELNIK, URSZULA M		
	STOCKTON LLP OURTH STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	LEM, NC 27101		3711		
			D. WELLIED 10/00/000	,	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				(
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/823,943	ROSENBERG, LOUIS B.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Urszula M. Cegielnik	3711				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per the properties of	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thi riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)[🔀]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	9 July 2006					
		This action is non-final.					
'=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>45-58</u> is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withe Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>45-58</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Applicati	on Papers	,					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Exame The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the core The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeya rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority ı	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	application No received in this National Stage				
Attachmen							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB r No(s)/Mail Date	F	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/823,943

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 45-50, and 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Publication No. 0977142, hereinafter EP '142 in view of British Patent Publication No. 2237160, hereinafter UK '160.

EP '142 discloses a housing (200); a manipulandum (220) disposed within the housing (200) and operable to cause a control signal to be sent to a remotely controlled device (i.e. a game computer, which may be considered as a toy, as anything that is capable of giving a person amusement); an actuator (300) coupled to the housing (200), the actuator (300) operable to output a force to at least one of the housing (200) or the manipulandum (220); the manipulandum is in the form of a directional control (arrow key 220).

EP '142 does not disclose a receiver disposed within the housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of the remotely controlled device; and a processor disposed within the housing in communication with the actuator and the receiver, the processor operable to generate an actuator signal

Application/Control Number: 09/823,943

Art Unit: 3711

associated with the state of the remotely controlled device, the manipulandum being a throttle control; the actuator signal operable to cause the actuator to output the force.

UK '160 discloses a joystick having a receiver disposed within a housing (page 2, lines 22-23) and operable to receive a sensor signal (i.e. infra-red link); the manipulandum is in the form of a throttle control.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a receiver disposed within the housing as taught by UK '160, since UK '160 states at page 3, lines 12-13, that such a modification would permit the joystick to be more portable.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time to provide a manipulandum in the form of a throttle control as taught by UK '160, since such a modification would provide an alternate control for a remotely controlled device.

Claims 51-54, 57, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claim 45 above, and further in view of Collier (US Patent No. 4,964,837).

EP '142, as modified by UK '142, lacks the claimed sensors and the remotely controlled device comprising a remotely controlled toy (remotely-controlled car).

Collier discloses a remotely controlled car that has a radio communication device having a transmitter (200), a contact sensor, pressure sensor, and an accelerometer (col. 15, lines 57-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the claimed sensors as taught by Collier, since Collier states at col. 15, lines 65-67, that such a modification would provide detection of various situations encountered by the remotely controlled device.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a transmitter as taught by Collier, since such a modification would enhance wireless communication between the remote control unit and the remotely controlled device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 19 July 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to Applicant's argument that the combination of Philips and Cheetah do not teach or suggest "a receiver disposed within the housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of the remotely-controlled device, the Examiner submits that the combination of Philips and Cheetah indeed teach a receiver disposed within the housing. With respect to "operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of the remotely-controlled device, Applicant has not provided sufficient structure to distinguish it over the prior art.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 09/823,943

Art Unit: 3711

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Urszula M. Cegielnik whose telephone number is 571-272-4420. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 5:45AM-2:15PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene L. Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EUGENE KIM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 5